Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Godshalk et al. (U.S. 5,506,515).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a high frequency measuring probe having a combination of elements, including a contact end for contacting planar structures and a coaxial cable end for connection to a coaxial cable, a co-planar conductor structure having at least two conductors arranged between the contact end and the coaxial cable end, and a solid dielectric mounting the co-planar conductor structure. The dielectric is arranged on at least one side of the co-planar conductor structure in a central section of the probe so as to be between and spaced from the coaxial cable end and the contact end. Each conductor in the co-planar conductor structure includes a portion formed to be individually free in space and resilient in relation to the dielectric. A respective gap is formed between each pair of conductors in the co-planar conductor structure from the coaxial cable end to the contact end so as to obtain a constant characteristic impedance from the coaxial cable end to the contact end.

The Godshalk high frequency measuring probe does not anticipate claim 1 because Godshalk does not include a dielectric arranged on a co-planar conductor structure in a central section of a probe, so the dielectric is disposed between and spaced from a coaxial cable and a contact end of the probe. The structure of claim 1 offers much more than a way of connecting a co-planar structure with a

coaxial cable; it also provides a match between the coaxial cable and contact ends of the probe.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Godshalk discloses a dielectric only in the region of the coaxial cable, since the dielectric is present only as part of the coaxial cable. In Godshalk, there is no dielectric in the region of co-planar structure 74 (see FIG. 4). Although the co-planar structure extends over the coaxial cable, the dielectric nevertheless forms part of a coaxial structure. Therefore, a coaxial region is formed where the coaxial cable and co-planar structure overlap electrically and physically. Since the dielectric is part of the coaxial cable, it obviously is not spaced from the coaxial cable.

As is clear from FIGS. 4, 5c, and 5d, in Godshalk, the distance between the conductors of the co-planar structure increases in the direction of the contact end of the measuring probe. This results in a change in impedance over the measuring probe, whereas in Applicant's structure of claim 1, the measuring probe is required to have a constant impedance over the complete co-planar structure. Godshalk's probe provides neither constant impedance nor impedance matching.

Clearly, Godshalk fails to disclose a high frequency measuring probe as set forth in Applicant's independent claim 1, wherein a dielectric is arranged on a co-planar conductor structure in a central section of a probe, so the dielectric is disposed between and spaced from a coaxial cable and a contact end of the probe, and two stacks of dielectrics mounting a co-planar structure

therebetween result in matching of impedance over the co-planar structure. Therefore, independent claim 1 is allowable over Godshalk. Claims 2-5 and 8 are also allowable due to their dependence on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the additional limitations provided by these claims.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Godshalk in view of Roach (U.S. 5,512,838). Roach does not cure the deficiencies of Godshalk. While the Office Action states circuit 16, as shown in FIG. 1B of Roach, is planar, Applicant is unable to find any disclosure that circuit 16 is planar. Applicant notes FIG. 5 of Roach shows a probe tip portion having multiple tip probe leads 60A, 60B, and 60C, each including flat lead conductors 61A, 66A, 63A, and 65A with rectangular cross-sections. However, it is not seen how this disclosure is germane to claim 1, upon which claims 6 and 7 depend.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are in order, and such action is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicant hereby requests any extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to credit any overpayment and/or to charge any prescribed fees not otherwise paid, including application